

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this Amendment, no claims were amended, added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-10 remain at issue.

#### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saether (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,219) in view of Greer (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,828). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner claims that: (1) the date and time of the last web page modification corresponds to the first difference information; (2) the different objects of the web page correspond to the leaf entries; (3) the object quotient field followed by the date and time correspond to the second difference information; (4) the URL field containing a quotient page with a URL corresponds to the filtering mask; and (5) the global quotient value corresponds to the mask schema. According to Greer, the URL field specifies whether the address of the web page has changed (see col. 3, lines 49-51). Thus, the URL field informs a user when a web page has been changed or updated, but does not inform the user when an object within the web page has been changed or updated. Accordingly, as discussed in response to the February 24, 2005 Office Action, the URL field containing a quotient page with a URL in Greer does not correspond to information of one of the leaf entries (*i.e.*, objects) being directly under one of the container entries (*i.e.*, web pages), as required by claim 1. Therefore, Greer does not disclose or suggest generating a first message including the first difference information and a mask schema for interpreting a filtering mask, the second message including the second difference information

and the filtering mask, wherein the filtering mask corresponds to information of one of the leaf entries being directly under one of the container entries or transmitting means for separately transmitting said first message and said second message, as required by claim 1, and it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Saether nor Greer to derive claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over Saether in view of Greer. Dependent claims 2 and 3 are also allowable over Saether in view of Greer by virtue of their dependencies on claim 1.


For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claims 1-3, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10 and dependent claims 6 and 9 are also allowable over Saether in view of Greer. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 24, 2006

By:   
Marina N. Saito  
Registration No. 42,121  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000